DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 240 FL 018 456

AUTHOR Berney, Tomi D.; Rosenberg, Jan
TITLE Summer Institute for Career Exploration (ICE), 1988. OREA Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY. Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment.
PUB DATE Jun 89
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education Programs; *Career Exploration; *English (Second Language); Federal Programs; High Schools; *Immigrants; Internship Programs; *Limited English Speaking; Literacy Education; Parent Participation; Program Evaluation; School Counseling; Second Language Instruction; Social Services; Student Adjustment; Summer Programs; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

In its fourth year, the English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) component of the Summer Institute for Career Exploration (ICE) program was funded by the federal government's Emergency Immigrant Education Assistance program. Program goals were to help recent immigrants develop English language skills, introduce students to high school requirements and expectations, and familiarize them with the world of work. The program also helped parents develop English skills at parent literacy centers. About 1,250 students from 20 countries participated, including newly-arrived immigrants and limited-English-proficient (LEP) students already enrolled in high school bilingual or ESL programs. Thirty of 34 participating schools had an ESL component consisting of a classroom-based curriculum in July and a choice of a 2-week cultural program or 4-week internship in August. Students received credit if they took the Occupational Education examination administered to all participants and successfully completed the program. Few LEP students took the exam and a small proportion passed. Program weaknesses include tying the ESL curriculum to an occupational education course, isolating cultural experiences in a separate, optional unit, lengthy student preparation for the program, and inadequately trained teachers. Strengths include staff commitment and staff development resources. A variety of recommendations for improvement are made. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED318240

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: FL

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. CE

OREA Report

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT
SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR CAREER EXPLORATION (ICE)

1988

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. Tobias

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL018456

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION SECTION
John Schoener, Chief Administrator
June 1989

EVALUATION SECTION REPORT
SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR CAREER EXPLORATION (ICE)

1988

Prepared by
The Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit
Tomi D. Berney, Unit Manager
Jan Rosenberg, Evaluation Consultant

New York City Board of Education
Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment
Robert Tobias, Director

NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Robert F. Wagner, Jr.
President

Dr. Irene H. Impellizzeri
Vice President

Dr. Gwendolyn C. Baker
Amalia V. Betanzos
Dr. Stephen R. Franse
James F. Regan
Edward L. Sadowsky

Bernard Mecklowitz
Chancellor

Dr. Dolores M. Fernandez
Deputy Chancellor for Instruction and Development

Dr. Harvey Robins
Deputy Chancellor for Financial Affairs

Joseph J. Saccente
Chief Executive for Operations

Amy Linden
Chief Executive for School Facilities

It is the policy of the New York City Board of Education not to discriminate on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin age, handicapping condition, sexual orientation, or sex in its educational programs, activities, and employment policies, as required by law. Any person who believes he or she has been discriminated against should contact his or her Local Equal Opportunity Coordinator. Inquiries regarding compliance with appropriate laws, including Title IX and Section 504, may also be directed to Mercedes A. Nesfield, Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 110 Livingston Street, Room 601, Brooklyn, New York 11201; or to the Director, Office of Civil Rights, United States Department of Education, 26 Federal Plaza, Room 33-130, New York, New York 10278.

5/22/89

SUMMER INSTITUTE FOR CAREER EXPLORATION--E.S.L. COMPONENT*
(SUMMER ICE)
1988

SUMMARY

- The English as a Second Language (E.S.L.) component of the Summer Institute for Career Exploration (Summer ICE) program was fully implemented. During the summer of 1988, students received instruction in E.S.L. within the context of an occupational education course, as well as guidance and counseling services. The program also offered activities and information for participants' parents.

In its fourth year, the E.S.L. component of the Summer ICE program was funded by the federal government's Emergency Immigrant Education Assistance program. The goals of the program were to help recent immigrants develop English-language skills, introduce students to high school requirements and expectations, and familiarize them with the world of work. This was to be achieved through a curricular emphasis and optional paid internships. The program also helped the participants' parents develop their English-language skills at Parent Literacy Centers. Over twelve hundred (1,250) limited English proficient (LEP) students from approximately 20 countries took part in the program. Participants included newly arrived immigrants and LEP students who were already enrolled in a high school bilingual or E.S.L. program.

Thirty of the 34 schools participating in the Summer ICE program had an E.S.L. component. It consisted of two parts: a classroom-based curriculum component during the month of July, and a choice of either a two-week cultural program (ICE-C)--trips to museums, plays, and movies--or a four-week paid job internship (ICE-J) in August. As recommended in the 1987 evaluation report, students received credit if they passed the Occupational Education examination given to all Summer ICE students and also successfully completed the program. Summer ICE provided students with guidance and counseling sessions; and offered parents E.S.L. courses, information about the educational system, job opportunities, and access to social service resources.

The Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment (OREA) evaluated the implementation of the 1988 Summer ICE program through staff interviews, classroom observations, and student questionnaires. Although there were no outcome objectives, it

---

*This summary is based on the final evaluation of the "Summer Institute for Career Exploration (ICE) 1987-88" prepared by the OREA Bilingual Education Evaluation Unit.

should be noted that very few LEP students took the Occupational Education examination and only a small proportion passed.

Weaknesses of the program included tying the E.S.L. curriculum to an occupational education course, isolating cultural experiences by placing them in an optional and discrete unit, having students endure a lengthy preparation for the ICE-J program, and hiring teachers who lacked training or experience in teaching E.S.L. Strengths included the dedication and commitment of the staff, and staff development resources that provided teachers with useful teaching strategies and materials.

The conclusions, based on the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendations:

- Begin recruiting both students and parents earlier. Students at each of the schools (both feeder and participating) might bring home flyers about the Summer ICE program and the Parent Literacy Centers.

- In order to define the role of guidance counselors, provide separate staff development activities for them, particularly at the beginning of the program.

- Consider reorienting the E.S.L. curriculum toward more basic E.S.L. skills and knowledge, especially for beginning-level E.S.L. students.

- Reintegrate cultural experiences into the classroom-based segment of the program. At the same time, maintain a more intensive cultural program in August, thus strengthening the ICE-C component.

- Streamline the process by which students are certified to work. Instead of bussing students from all over the city to fill out forms and present their documents, consider having a small number of staff people travel to program sites.

- Provide translators to assist LEP students with processing job applications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In addition to those listed on the title page, we would like to thank Beth Schlau for editing the report, Margaret Scorza for coordinating the evaluation and report production, Milton Vickerman for analyzing the data, and Betty Morales for typing the report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Participating Students	1
	Delivery of Services	5
	Staff	5
	Setting	6
	History of Program	6
	Report Format	6
II.	EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	8
	Evaluation Questions	8
	Evaluation Procedures	8
	Sample	8
	Instruments	9
	Data Collection	9
	Data Analysis	9
	Limitations	10
III.	EVALUATION FINDINGS: NONINSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES.	11
	Student Recruitment	11
	Newtown High School	11
	Student Enrollment	12
	Staff	14
	Teachers	14
	Student Mentors	14
	Guidance Counselors	14
	Staff Development	15
	Support Services	15
	Parental Involvement	16
	The Summer ICE Program in August	17
	Cultural (ICE-C) Activities	17
	Job-training (ICE-J) Activities	17
	Program Concerns	18
	Staff Issues	18
	Timing Issues	20
	ICE-C	20
	ICE-J	20
	Student Perceptions of Program	23
IV.	EVALUATION FINDINGS: INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES	24
	English as a Second Language	24
	Occupational Education	26
	Program Concerns	27
	Students' Perceptions of the Program	29
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	31

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

Table 1: Number and Percent of Project Participants by Country of Birth 2

Table 2: Number and Percent of Project Participants by Native Language 3

Table 3: Grade Distribution of Participating Students 4

Table 4: Participating Schools by Borough 7

Table 5: Participants' Reasons for Attending Summer School..13

I. INTRODUCTION

This report documents the Office of Research, Evaluation, and Assessment's (OREA's) evaluation of the E.S.L. component of the Summer Institute for Career Exploration (Summer ICE) program, which was funded by the federal government's Emergency Immigrant Education Assistance Program. The project completed its fourth year in the summer of 1988. It was created to help targeted middle school students in their transition to high school. The Summer ICE program serves Chapter I-eligible, special education, and Limited English Proficient (LEP) students.

PARTICIPATING STUDENTS

A total of 1,250 LEP students participated in the E.S.L. component of the 1988 Summer ICE program at 30 high schools. The greatest number of students came from the People's Republic of China, followed by the Dominican Republic and Haiti. (See Table 1.) As might be expected, Chinese was the most widely spoken native language among project participants, followed by Spanish. (See Table 2.)

Students in the Summer ICE program had lived in the United States a little over three years and had attended school for most of that time. Typically, they had more years of education in their native countries, the average being seven years.

The majority of program students were in the ninth grade; most of the others were in the eighth. (See Table 3.) A few were in grades six, seven, ten, eleven, and twelve.

TABLE 1

Number and Percent of Project Participants
by Country of Birth

Country of Birth	Number	Percent
People's Republic of China	378	34.2
Dominican Republic	183	16.6
Haiti	122	11.0
U.S.A.	48	4.3
Colombia	41	3.7
Ecuador	36	3.3
Vietnam	35	3.2
Hong Kong	33	3.0
Puerto Rico	19	1.7
Honduras	17	1.5
Korea	16	1.4
Peru	15	1.4
Mexico	13	1.2
Argentina	11	1.0
Guyana	10	0.9
El Salvador	10	0.9
Other	41	3.7
Unknown	76	6.9
TOTAL	1,104	99.9*

Source: Student questionnaire.

*Less than 100 percent due to rounding.

- The largest number of program students were from the People's Republic of China, followed by the Dominican Republic and Haiti.

TABLE 2

Number and Percent of Project Participants
by Native Language

Language	Number	Percent
Chinese	441	39.9
Spanish	401	36.3
French	64	5.8
Haitian Creole	64	5.8
Vietnamese	31	2.8
English	20	1.8
Korean	16	1.4
Polish	3	0.3
Greek	2	0.2
Khmer	1	0.1
Unknown	61	5.5
TOTAL	1,104	99.9*

Source: Student questionnaire.

*Less than 100 percent due to rounding.

- Most participating students listed either Chinese or Spanish as their native language.

TABLE 3

Grade Distribution of Participating Students

Grade	Number	Percent
6	2	0.2
7	8	0.7
8	357	32.3
9	458	41.5
10	96	8.7
11	27	2.4
12	3	0.3
Unreported	153	13.8
Total	1,104	99.9*

Source: Student questionnaires.

*Less than 100 percent due to rounding.

Most students had been in eighth or ninth grade in the academic semester before participating in the Summer ICE program.

DELIVERY OF SERVICES

Those Summer ICE program sites that had an E.S.L. component offered LEP students a two-part program. The first included 20 days of classroom-based instruction consisting of two 90-minute classes: E.S.L. and introduction to occupations. The second phase offered two options: ICE-C, a two-week program that included cultural and career-oriented field trips; and ICE-J, a four-week program that provided paid, supervised jobs at various city government agencies.

STAFF

Operating under the program manager of the Division of High Schools' Office of High School Bilingual/E.S.L. Programs, the E.S.L. component's central staff consisted of a supervisor, a coordination assistant, a bilingual counselor/coordinator, and eight staff development specialists. The central LEP supervisor was responsible for managing all the activities of the E.S.L. program. The coordination assistant's responsibilities included organizing staff development activities, recruiting students and parents, collecting instructional materials, and establishing instructional guidelines. The bilingual counselor/coordinator supervised the provision of guidance and counseling services to the LEP students. Eight E.S.L. staff development specialists worked directly with teachers and educational assistants, and served as liaisons between the central program administration and school-based personnel.

School-based staff for the E.S.L. component of the program consisted of 30 site supervisors, 17 guidance counselors (16 of whom were bilingual), 70 teachers, and 70 educational assistants. In addition, 367 student mentors (former LEP students) frequently worked in E.S.L. classrooms that lacked bilingual educational assistants.

SETTING

Participating schools were in the boroughs of Manhattan (7 schools), the Bronx (5 schools), Brooklyn (11 schools), and Queens (7 schools). (See Table 4.)

HISTORY OF THE PROGRAM

Previous evaluation reports of the Summer ICE program have presented an historical account of the program. Changes from previous years will be noted in the present report.

REPORT FORMAT

This report is organized as follows: Chapter II describes the evaluation methodology; Chapter III presents a description of the noninstructional activities of the program and the qualitative findings of the evaluation; Chapter IV presents qualitative findings regarding the program's instructional activities; and Chapter V offers conclusions and recommendations based upon the results of the evaluation.

TABLE 4

Participating Schools by Borough

Manhattan	Bronx	Brooklyn	Queens
Murry Bergtraum	Jane Addams	Automotive	John Bowne
Louis D. Brandeis	John F. Kennedy	John Dewey	Far Rockaway
Fashion Industries	Adlai E. Stevenson	Eastern District	Long Island City
Seward Park	Theodore Roosevelt	Erasmus Hall	August Martin
Norman Thomas	William H. Taft	Fort Hamilton	Newtown
George Washington		John Jay	Richmond Hill
Washington Irving		Edward R. Murrow	Springfield Gardens
		Prospect Heights	
		Paul Robeson	
		Westinghouse	
		George W. Wingate	

- Brooklyn had the largest number of participating schools.
- No Staten Island schools participated in the E.S.L. component of the Summer ICE program in 1988.

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation assessed program implementation. Evaluation questions included the following:

- Did the program select students for program participation according to specific criteria?
- Did the program place target students according to their current level of performance?
- Did the project recruit qualified staff?
- Which of the activities or services for parents appeared to be the most successful?

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Sample

During the first part of the Summer ICE program, OREA field consultants visited 24 of the 30 sites with an E.S.L. component. During these site visits, the team observed classes and interviewed site supervisors, staff development specialists, teachers, guidance counselors, and educational assistants. In most cases visits took place on the schools' weekly staff development day so that OREA staff could attend staff meetings. In the second part of the Summer ICE program, a field consultant sat in on several meetings of the job coaches (Summer ICE program teachers responsible for students in their month-long job placements), spoke informally with two of them, and interviewed several central Summer ICE program administrators. Eighty-eight percent (1,104) of the LEP students enrolled in Summer ICE completed OREA's questionnaires.

Instruments

OREA developed an evaluation questionnaire for participating LEP students in seven languages: English, Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, French, Haitian Creole, and Korean. The purpose of the questionnaire was to elicit demographic information from the students, as well as their impressions and attitudes about the program. Consultants also used an OREA-developed observation schedule to describe classes and the activities that took place within them, and OREA-developed interview schedules with program personnel whom they interviewed.

Data Collection

OREA staff interviewed school-based personnel and observed ICE classes during the month of July. In August, they attended meetings and interviewed job coaches and central program administrators. Students completed their questionnaires during the last week of July.

Data Analysis

This evaluation presents the impressions of participants, project personnel, and OREA staff members of the operation, strengths, and weaknesses of the 1988 Summer ICE program. Evaluators computed the statistical frequencies of interview and student questionnaire responses. It did not compare students participating in the program to similar students not

participating in the program, or attempt to assess the long-term impact of the program.

Limitations

The scheduling of two 90-minute classes in the three-hour program made it impossible for field consultants to schedule student interviews. It was difficult to ascertain whether the Summer ICE program's Introduction to Occupations classes assisted students in passing the Occupational Education (Occ. Ed.) examination since so few students actually took the examination.

III. EVALUATION FINDINGS: NONINSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

STUDENT RECRUITMENT

Incoming ninth and tenth grade LEP students were eligible to participate in Summer ICE's E.S.L. component. Schools followed the same recruitment procedures they had in the past; that is, they began to actively publicize and recruit participants for the program in May or June. At that time, site supervisors (who were typically appointed in late spring) sent letters to principals and guidance counselors at feeder schools that introduced the program, highlighted its instructional, cultural, and employment components, and described the opportunity students would have to earn one credit in occupational education.

In addition, most schools sent letters (usually in the appropriate native language) to graduating junior high school students and their parents. In some schools, teachers made follow-up visits to feeder schools; in others, guidance counselors served as recruiters.

Newtown High School

As in previous years, Newtown High School was very effective in recruiting students, enrolling approximately 190 LEP students for its Summer 1988 ICE program.

The E.S.L. staff development specialist for Newtown's Summer ICE program was the school's assistant principal for E.S.L. during the year. During April and May, she told three

feeder schools when she visited them to test LEP students for fall E.S.L. placement. She distributed "unofficial" applications in English, Chinese, Korean, and Spanish, and gave applications and program information to the school's E.S.L. coordinators. She also visited every E.S.L. class at Newtown and told students about Summer ICE offerings.

In mid-June the E.S.L. staff development specialist sent postcards to parents as a follow-up to the application process. This postcard was the "ticket of admission" that students brought with them on the first day of class.

STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Schools in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens participated in the Summer ICE program of 1988. Since students did not always report which Summer ICE site they attended, data regarding the number of students at each site is not available. When questioned, students gave a variety of reasons for wanting to attend the summer program. (See Table 5.)

TABLE 5

Participants' Reasons for Attending Summer School
(N = 955)

Reason	Number*	Percent
To learn to speak English better	774	81.0
To improve in reading and writing	535	56.0
To find out about high school programs	420	44.0
To find out what my new school would be like	334	35.0
To attend ICE-C	200	21.0
To attend ICE-J	191	20.0
To go on trips	191	20.0
To be with friends	162	17.0
Other	124	13.0

Source: Student questionnaire.

*Multiple responses are possible.

- Students most frequently cited improving their English language skills as a reason for attending the Summer ICE program.

STAFF

The duties of the supervisor, coordination assistant, bilingual counselor/coordinator, staff development specialists, site supervisors, and bilingual educational assistants had not changed since the 1987 Summer ICE program cycle.

Teachers

The teachers, in addition to their teaching duties described in July, supervised students during either ICE-C or ICE-J in the first two weeks of August. A smaller number remained in the ICE-J program to supervise students in their job placements.

Student Mentors

Site supervisors frequently assigned a student mentor to E.S.L. classrooms that lacked bilingual educational assistants. Their role was the same as it had been last year. There were 367 student mentors this summer.

Guidance Counselors

There were 17 guidance counselors, 16 of whom were bilingual. For the most part, their responsibilities were the same as they had been last year. This summer, one guidance counselor was itinerant and served four schools in Brooklyn. Two schools, Newtown and Theodore Roosevelt, had two full-time counselors because of their large enrollments and linguistic diversity. Several of the smallest Summer ICE/E.S.L. programs

did not employ separate counselors for the program. Students in these programs met with mainstream counselors. Counselors spent a great deal of time assisting site supervisors with administrative and clerical matters, including monitoring attendance and determining students' job readiness.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Formal staff development activities occurred once in June and then once during each week of the program. E.S.L. teachers and all others who taught LEP students participated in these weekly afternoon in-service workshops, conducted by staff development specialists and/or site supervisors. Guidance counselors also met with other staff members in weekly staff development sessions to discuss educational issues and problems in the program.

The bilingual guidance counselor/coordinator said that counselors did not benefit much from staff development activities and that discussions on methods of improving the delivery of guidance services would have been beneficial to them.

SUPPORT SERVICES

The Summer ICE program established guidance and counseling services to provide LEP students with useful factual information about high school, and a rudimentary support system to ease their transition from middle school to high school. Counselors

also sought to answer questions and address issues about work and careers that the students would probably face.

The guidance counselors conducted regular group sessions in which they discussed high school requirements and expectations, and gave information about such topics as the two-term academic year and its implications for student work, high school culture, behavior codes, self-knowledge, and how to relate to teachers and peers. They also covered work-related topics such as how to dress for job interviews and how to learn about job openings. Counselors met occasionally with students on an individual basis to discuss personal problems.

Students reported that they benefited most from discussions of job and career possibilities and requirements, high school offerings and requirements, and problems encountered in high school.

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

Parents of program students participated in two types of activities: Parent Literacy Centers and parents' days at program sites.

There were four literacy centers at which parents learned English and basic New York City survival skills such as getting around on the subway, calling the police, etcetera. Center enrollment varied. A field consultant observed two centers where fewer than ten parents were present. At a third center, she observed two full classrooms of parents studying English,

while their children played and learned in the child care center that the program provided.

All Summer ICE program sites sponsored parents' days during which parents learned about the program and saw what their children had accomplished. Attendance was generally low at these events.

THE SUMMER ICE PROGRAM IN AUGUST

The conclusion of the academic program led immediately into one oi two options: cultural (ICE-C) and job-training (ICE-J) activities. The program mandated that every participant choose one of the options.

Cultural Activities (ICE-C)

ICE-C activities consisted of a two-week series of cultural and career-related field trips which took place during the morning at each site. Most (990) LEP students elected to participate in ICE-C. They visited career-exploration centers, radio and television stations, colleges, the stock market, and a number of museums throughout the city. They kept logs and wrote short essays after each excursion.

The staff at each site usually consisted of the site supervisor, several teachers, a guidance counselor, educational assistants, and several student mentors.

Job-training Activities (ICE-J)

The job-training activities component (ICE-J) consisted of a four-week (August 2-29) paid internship in a wide range of New

York City government agencies, usually in offices, but sometimes in city parks. The Board of Education's Office of Collaborative Programs (O.C.P.) coordinated and administered the component, in which 220 LEP students participated.

ICE-J teachers (job coaches) supervised student workers at a designated number (usually 10-15) of job sites. They helped students resolve problems that arose with their supervisors or co-workers, with O.C.P. concerning paychecks, or even with their parents.

Weekly staff meetings of the job coaches and the O.C.P. administrative staff served several important functions: O.C.P. staff communicated factual information (lists of students at particular job sites, which students needed to get paid, etcetera.). Job coaches told the O.C.P. staff how the program was working and what the problems were. Job coaches also had the opportunity to share reactions and impressions with each other.

PROGRAM CONCERNS

Staff Issues

Teachers. Several major staffing problems surfaced repeatedly during the evaluation of the 1988 Summer ICE program. Many site supervisors complained about the centralized hiring process: in previous years, site supervisors had been able to select the teachers who would work at their sites and they resented the loss of control.

The major staffing problem of previous summers (the lack of a suitable fit between staff qualifications and program needs) was less of a problem in 1988, but it did continue to trouble the Summer ICE program. This year, the E.S.L. teacher at one high school had a physical education license; at another school, the E.S.L. teacher had a special education license and was teaching E.S.L. for the first time. Similarly, many teachers assigned to teach introduction to occupations classes were not trained or experienced Occ. Ed. teachers. While they may have been excellent teachers, they lacked education and experience in critical areas.

Guidance Counselors. Guidance counselors inherited a lot of the additional paperwork generated by the increased emphasis on the job-related aspects of the current program. Although they were overqualified for that kind of work, they did it because of their vague and loosely defined job responsibilities. Clerical/secretarial staff could have handled the additional paperwork more efficiently. The guidance counselors also had no forum at which to meet, compare experiences, discuss common problems and strategies, or share ideas. OREA staff who visited some program sites noted the contrasts between the vague role of the guidance counselors and the well-defined role of the teachers and staff development specialists.

Timing Issues

Many program staff members felt that the program administrators hired staff too late, recruited students too late, and ordered and received materials too late. Teachers felt that staff development activities took place too late for them to incorporate their new knowledge into their lesson plans for that year.

ICE-C

Most of the teachers and administrators who were interviewed felt that the cultural experiences included in the program were too isolated from classroom-based learning, since they were mostly confined to the first ten days of August. Those who had participated in previous Summer ICE programs missed the ongoing, integrated cultural experiences (such as plays, movies, and museum visits) which had provided a change of pace and a basis for imaginative discussions. Project personnel said that there was little integration between classroom learning and the cultural component of the program.

ICE-J

The August job experience component was a new feature of the Summer ICE program. Once it was fully operative, most teachers were impressed by the student workers. They reported that the students were, on the whole, very cooperative, reliable, and responsible.

Paperwork. ICE-J activities demanded a massive amount of paperwork in order to help the students become job-ready. To get working papers, students had to produce documents and fill out numerous forms. This created unexpected clerical work for the site supervisors and/or guidance counselors. Hiring more clerical staff would have eased this burden. A few staff members suggested that in the future students have their social security numbers and working papers before they enter the Summer ICE program. However, while it is true that getting these papers is a time-consuming procedure that disrupts the continuity of instruction, it would be difficult for students whose English is limited to obtain them on their own.

Time for administrative tasks. Site supervisors reported great difficulty in finding the time to perform their necessary administrative duties. Several said that there was not sufficient time to visit classrooms, confer with teachers on an individual basis, and meet their administrative obligations.

Job coaches unsure of role. Some job coaches said they did not know exactly what was expected of them before the program began. Once they began supervising the employed students, they were clear as to the extent of their responsibilities.

Indecision in July. Considerable uncertainty and anxiety loomed over the ICE-J program in July. Teachers, counselors, and site supervisors were very skeptical of O.C.P. staffs' ability to identify sufficient and/or suitable jobs for students. A memo in late July, in which O.C.P. denied that it

had promised jobs to ICE-J students, appeared to confirm that there would not be enough jobs for all the students. Despite the staffs' fears, however, the program administrators had placed all qualified students in jobs by early August.

Lack of organization. Job processing was bureaucratic, cumbersome, and inefficient. Students were bussed from Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens to a chaotic central job readiness site in Manhattan, where they could complete several simple forms and present the required documents. Documenting their status and completing forms was made more difficult due to the students' lack of English language skills. After completing the forms, students were required to undergo physical examinations at a nearby office. Several groups arrived too late in the day; these students went back to their schools and returned for their physical examinations on a different day.

One day, a field consultant was present at the job processing center when a group of students arrived without the necessary documents. The teacher who accompanied them said that no one had given the staff any information about what the students needed to bring with them. The students returned to the Bronx and came back to Manhattan the following week to fill out their forms and undergo physical examinations. When their teacher requested that some of the central ICE staff come to his school to help process the ICE-J students' papers, he was told that it was impossible.

Systematic translation. The program did not consistently provide translators for non-English-speaking students. Site supervisors received no instructions regarding translations. Occasionally, a school sent a bilingual staff member to help students at the job processing and physical examination sites.

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM

Students met infrequently with their guidance counselors (90 percent saw them four times or less and of these, 29 percent saw them only twice). The students were evenly divided as to whether or not they were satisfied with the number of times they had seen their counselors. This was not a function of whether the counselor spoke the students' native language or not. Dissatisfied students felt this way regardless of whether their counselors spoke their native language or not.

When questioned about which aspects of the Summer ICE program they liked most, 44 percent (420) of the 955 respondents selected the opportunity to participate in cultural activities, 31 percent (296) said the opportunity to have a job, and 20 percent (191) responded that the meetings with their counselors was their favorite part of the program. Sixteen percent of the students (153) said that they disliked participating in cultural activities; 14 percent (134) disliked the opportunity to have a job; and 13 percent (124) selected meetings with the counselor as being their least favorite part of the program.

IV. EVALUATION FINDINGS: INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

Summer ICE instructional activities consisted of two 90-minute classes: E.S.L. and Introduction to Occupations. The E.S.L. course's major goal was to teach English language skills to newly arrived LEP students. Occupational education introduced students to the world of work and acquainted them with high school requirements. At all sites, Summer ICE program personnel integrated the E.S.L. and the occupational education courses. The mandate given to the teachers was to infuse the occupational education curriculum with an E.S.L. perspective, and to teach E.S.L. from an occupational education perspective.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

OREA field consultants observed beginning-level E.S.L. classes in which students viewed pictures of people in various occupations. Students then named the jobs, recounted the activities involved, and described the training and education necessary for them. In a variation of this lesson, the teacher or students mimed such activities as taking photographs or washing clothes, and then asked the rest of the class to name and describe the activities and occupations they represented.

At one high school, beginning-level E.S.L. students sat in small groups and examined magazine photos of people doing different kinds of work. The teacher asked the students to think of names for occupations in different career fields such as restaurants, health care, and advertising.

Intermediate and advanced E.S.L. classes often had students write resumes and participate in mock interviews. One intermediate-level E.S.L. class focused on the importance of making a good first impression, of treating others fairly, and of showing a positive attitude.

Students at another high school did an interesting variation of this assignment. The teacher gave students fact sheets describing applicants for a baby-sitting job, asked them to select the leading candidate, and explain their choice to the class. The assignment required students to read, think, construct and present an argument defending their choice, and critically listen and respond to others' arguments. Another segment of this class involved a dramatization of someone being interviewed for a position as an auto mechanic. The teacher read the dialogue first, then the students read it with her, and finally the students took turns playing each part. The students were involved not only in practicing English, but in thinking about what a job interview would be like for them. The students seemed attentive and eager to learn during the class, which was conducted entirely in English. A bilingual paraprofessional and student mentor provided help when needed.

A field consultant observed an interesting and innovative approach by a monolingual art teacher in an E.S.L. class who developed a creative hands-on approach despite a lack of appropriate E.S.L. training. In one project, for example, students tie-dyed T-shirts and then wrote, in English, to a

friend in their native country about the design they had created, the process of tie-dyeing, etcetera.

OCCUPATIONAL EDUCATION

The entire 1988 Summer ICE program used the New York State occupational education curriculum. This consisted of 32 lessons, including the role of trade unions in shaping working conditions, resume writing, values clarification, and thinking about one's future work and career.

In most classes, lessons centered around basic themes. A bilingual guidance counselor discussed some critical attributes of a job: job satisfaction, remuneration, and proficiency. In the second part of this lesson, the teacher divided the students into small groups. They looked through fashion magazines, cut out pictures of people who were dressed appropriately for a job interview, and wrote down what each person was wearing. This task integrated dressing for an interview with learning new vocabulary.

A few schools defined their approach to occupational education somewhat differently; the curriculum was more focused. At one school, program administrators assigned intermediate-level E.S.L. students to computer instruction and advanced E.S.L. students to electronics classes. Other schools wove some introductory computer classes into their Occ. Ed. curriculum. Common uses of the computer involved writing resumes and business letters. According to observers, students appeared to enjoy working with computers.

Many sites sought to provide variety as well as hands-on experience. At one high school, LEP students could choose a class from among a range of hands-on Occ. Ed. classes.

PROGRAM CONCERNS

Materials and curriculum were two major instructional problems of the 1988 Summer ICE program. Many teachers, staff development specialists, and site supervisors viewed the curriculum as inappropriate for students who needed to learn English. Teachers and site supervisors repeatedly told OREA consultants how difficult it was this year (as in the past) to get needed materials on time. This was a particular problem for teachers who worked at program sites which were different from the schools where they taught during the regular academic year; they had no knowledge of where program stocks, supplies, and materials were kept.

Most teachers, staff development specialists, and site supervisors were very critical of the occupational education focus for teaching English to new immigrants. Staff members at 14 of the 24 schools visited by OREA consultants expressed anger at being "boxed in" by this narrow curriculum. When asked if they liked teaching in the program, and for suggestions for improving it, over half the professional staff criticized the curriculum, calling it "inappropriate," "too extensive," or "irrelevant." Their concerns were in two areas: 1) anxieties about their students' abilities to pass the test on which credit

was to be based and 2) anger that the curriculum was too narrow and detailed for the needs of new immigrants.

One site supervisor was very critical of the new occupational education curriculum because it imposed difficult topics on students who could barely understand English. He recommended that the Summer ICE program drop the occupational curriculum and offer (as it had done previously) a selection of themes for each school. The professional staff at another school voiced similar feelings. They said the program was "too academically intense" for the students. One staff development specialist talked about an intellectual "narrowing in, a backing away from the more cultural emphases of previous ICE programs in favor of a limited job orientation." "We should be expanding their world, broadening it in a liberal arts direction," she said. She echoed many teachers' fears when she said that she felt very few students (particularly, but not exclusively, E.S.L. students) would be able to pass the test at the end of the classroom-based program.

The granting of credit for introduction to occupations classes and the passing of the state examination initially created more problems than it solved. Teachers who had previously wanted the program to be credit-bearing now complained that the threat of the test, and the specter of failing it, hung over the entire program, further restricting the breadth of what they could teach. Many teachers felt that the purpose of the occ. ed. course was inappropriate for young

students who were newly arrived in the country and who were not yet fluent in the English language or comfortable with American culture.

E.S.L. teachers' and staff developers' apprehensions about the examination led to several innovations. First, the staff development specialists rewrote the introduction to occupations examination questions in simplified English, to give the LEP students a better chance of understanding the language of the examination. Second, site supervisors were allowed to excuse students who lacked enough facility in English from taking the examination. Despite these efforts, only 410 of the 1,250 LEP students took the examination and only 29 percent (120) passed. This contrasts sharply with the 2,550 mainstream Summer ICE program students: 2,476 took the exam and 45 percent (1,114) passed.

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE PROGRAM

A majority of LEP students in the Summer ICE program (78 percent of the 955 respondents) reported that they liked their E.S.L. classes more than any other aspect of the program. Only 15 percent said that they liked those classes the least. A program teacher told an OREA field consultant that the students were highly motivated and had excellent attendance; he estimated that the students in his class maintained 95 percent attendance levels. All personnel interviewed about the instructional component of the program agreed that the students enjoyed the courses they were taking. They said that students felt that

they were developing and expanding their knowledge of the English language and American culture. From the students' perspective, the instructional component of the 1988 Summer ICE program was a success.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The E.S.L. component of the 1988 Summer ICE program achieved many of its goals. Despite the short duration of the summer program and the limited number of hours available for instruction each day, the students applied themselves seriously to their studies and worked assiduously.

Several difficulties surfaced at numerous program sites. The problems and subsequent criticisms were in the following areas: staff and staff development, planning, equipment and supplies, and certain aspects of the ICE-C and ICE-J components. More than half the teachers, staff developers, and site supervisors strongly criticized the occupational education focus of the E.S.L. curriculum for LEP students. The staff disliked the isolation of cultural experiences into a discrete, optional program component, as well as the lack of organization in ICE-J activities.

Several major changes distinguished the 1988 Summer ICE program from that of previous years. In response to previous recommendations, the program offered high school credit for the first time to participants who completed the program and passed the Introduction to Occupations examination.

The academic component of the program consisted of classes five mornings a week, compared to four in 1987. In previous Summer ICE programs, weekly field trips to plays, museums, and parks were an integral part of the program. In 1988, the program confined the cultural and career-related field trips to

the first two weeks in August. This year's program emphasized the work/career focus far more heavily than in previous years. Every school taught introduction to occupations courses. Eligible ICE-J students worked at jobs in city agencies for the entire month of August. In contrast, the only work available in 1987 had been part-time jobs during the afternoons in July. ICE-J was, therefore, far more ambitious and successful than it had been in the past.

Of the 17 guidance counselors in the program in 1988, 16 were bilingual. In 1987 only ten of the 16 counselors were bilingual. Having guidance counselors who spoke their native languages should have had a positive effect on the students. However, the ambivalent feelings of the students toward the counselors may have been due to their lack of understanding of the role of the guidance counselor.

The conclusions, based on the findings of this evaluation, lead to the following recommendations:

- Begin recruiting both students and parents earlier. Students at each of the schools (both feeder and participating) might bring home flyers about the Summer ICE program and the Parent Literacy Centers.
- In order to define the role of guidance counselors, provide separate staff development activities for them, particularly at the beginning of the program.
- Consider reorienting the E.S.L. curriculum toward more basic E.S.L. skills and knowledge, particularly for beginning-level E.S.L. students.
- Reintegrate cultural experiences into the classroom-based segment of the program. At the same time, maintain a more intensive cultural program in August, thus strengthening the ICE-C component.

- Streamline the process by which students are certified to work. Instead of bussing students from all over the city to fill out forms and present their documents, consider having a small number of staff people travel to the program sites.

- Provide translators to assist LEP students with job processing.